IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 53150

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	
	)	**Filed: November 4, 2026**
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	
	)	**Melanie Gagnepain, Clerk**
v.	)	
	)	**THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED**
LACEY EAGLE THE BOY,	)	**OPINION AND SHALL NOT**
	)	**BE CITED AS AUTHORITY**
Defendant-Appellant.	)	
	)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Shoshone County. Hon. Barbara Buchanan, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentences of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for felony possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, and a minimum period of confinement of two years for felony attempted destruction, alteration, or concealment of evidence, affirmed.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender; Sally J. Cooley, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Raúl R. Labrador, Attorney General; Kacey L. Jones, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LORELLO, Judge; FLEMING, Judge
and PETTY, Judge

PER CURIAM

Lacey Eagle The Boy was found guilty of felony possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver (Idaho Code § 37-2732(a)(1)(A)), and felony attempted destruction, alteration, or concealment of evidence (I.C. § 18-2603).[1] The district court sentenced The Boy to a unified

[1] The Boy was also found guilty of misdemeanor possession of marijuana (I.C. § 37-2732(c)(3)), misdemeanor reckless driving (I.C. § 49-1401(1)), and misdemeanor possession of open container by driver (I.C. § 23-505(2)); those convictions are not at issue in this appeal.

sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years, for felony possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, and a minimum period of confinement of two years for felony attempted destruction, alteration, or concealment of evidence. The district court ordered that the sentences run concurrently. The Boy appeals, arguing that his sentences are excessive.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Our role is limited to determining whether reasonable minds could reach the same conclusion as the district court. *State v. Biggs*, 168 Idaho 112, 116, 480 P.3d 150, 154 (Ct. App. 2020). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, The Boy's judgment of conviction and sentences are affirmed.